

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 20-25 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 6, and 16 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 17, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 5-6, 8-16, and 20-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5-6, 8-16, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shen *et al.* (US 2003/0149890). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature set forth in the subject claims of applicants' claimed invention.

The claimed subject matter provides for protection and tracking of information distributed in electronic form. To this end, amended independent claim 1 recites *a method of storing digitally-encoded material, the method comprising: associating a unique identifier with the digitally-encoded material and encrypting the combination; and associating one or more built-in functions with the encrypted digitally-encoded material such that the unique identifier and the built-in functions are coupled to the digitally-encoded material, the built-in functions governing transforms and rendering of the digitally-encoded material, wherein the digitally-encoded material can be transformed and rendered only by the built-in functions.* Independent claim 6 recites *appending a unique identifier to the digitally-encoded material; encrypting a combination including the digitally-encoded material and the unique identifier; and appending built-in function source code and the encrypted combination to form an executable entity capable of being executed independent of a particular operating system, wherein the digitally-encoded material can be transformed and rendered only by the built-in functions.* Independent claim 11 recites *a unique identifier; digitally-encoded material associated with the unique identifier; and one or more built-in functions coupled to the digitally-encoded material, the built-in functions govern transforms and render the digitally-encoded material independent of a particular operating system, and wherein the digitally-encoded material can be*

transformed and rendered only by the built-in function. Independent claim 16 recites similar features. Shen *et al.* is silent regarding such novel features.

Shen *et al.* relates to identical content to be protected by different IPMP systems, and an application enabling content protected utilizing an intellectual property management and protection (IPMP) system, to be used by a different IPMP system. In order to achieve such a system, Shen *et al.* discloses storing IPMP tool information in addition to a content identifier in a specific single packet at the beginning of the actual content stream. This IPMP tool information packet contains information regarding type of IPMP tool used for content protection, IPMP tool location type, and location from where the IPMP tool can be retrieved (See Shen *et al.* paragraphs [0009] – [0012]). At the terminal side the content stream passes through the IPMP tool management function module and the IPMP tool is retrieved after local or remote authentication and the retrieved IPMP Tool is used by the terminal to render the content (See Shen *et al.* paragraphs [0017]-[0019]). Hence, it is submitted that contrary to the assertion on page 3 of the subject Office Action, Shen *et al.* does not teach appending built in functions to the content (or digitally encoded material). Rather Shen *et al.* teaches, appending information regarding the playback tool to the data packet at the beginning of the content stream. The information is used by a terminal to retrieve the appropriate tool to play the content. The functions to render the content would be compiled into the IPMP tool itself and not with the content.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter provides for *built-in functions that transform or and render the content to be compiled with the content as recited in independent claim 6 which recites: **appending built-in function source code to the encrypted combination to form an executable entity capable of being executed independent of a particular operating system.** Or similarly as recited in independent claim 21: **forming an executable entity capable of being executed independent of a particular operating system by appending built-in function source code to the encrypted combination.** These functions can include one or more of Copy, Paste or Print for transforming the content, as recited by claim 7, and built-in functions that are rendering functions include one or more of close, find shape, full screen, go to, guides, help, open, order, pan, properties, reveal, rotate/flip, search, select, size and position, spell check, or zoom to render the content, as recited by claim 9. Shen *et al.* is silent regarding such novel features recited by independent claim 21 and claims 7 and 9.*

In view of the above, it is clear that Shen *et al.* does not disclose or suggest novel features recited by the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 21 (and the claims that depend there from) be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 2-3, 17, and 22-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-3, 17, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen *et al.*, and further in view of Matsuyama *et al.* (US 6,574,611). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 2-3, 17 and 22-23 depend from independent claims 1, 16 and 21. As discussed supra, Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all features recited by independent claims 1, 16 and 21. Matsuyama *et al.* relates to an information providing medium that performs the processing of registering users and their information processing apparatuses into content-providing systems, and fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 16 and 21. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 4 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen *et al.* as applied to claims 1 and 6, and further in view of Rabinovitch (US 2006/0101521). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 4 and 7 depend from independent claims 1 and 6. As discussed supra, Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all features recited by independent claims 1 and 6. Rabinovitch *et al.* relates to a system and method for secure usage right management of digital products, but fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 24-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shen *et al.*, Matsuyama *et al.* and Rabinovitch as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Nelson (US 6,691,229). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 24-25 depend from independent claims 21. As discussed supra, Shen *et al.* and Matsuyama *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest all features

recited by independent claim 21. Rabinovitch *et al.* relates to a system and method for secure usage right management of digital products, but fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 6. Nelson relates to preparing traceable copies of digital content and a method of adding a unique identifier to the digitally encoded content in a manner which does not alter the intended effect of the content, and fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claim 21. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP1150US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731